

REMARKS

Claim 7 was objected to because of informalities. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,245,155 (Pratt et al.). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 2004/0191064 (Guo). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. or Guo in view of US 2,288,433 (Boetcher et al.) or US 2,662,277 (Stone). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt or Guo in view of Boetcher or Stone, and further in view of US 4,224,499 (Jones) or US 2004/0169022 (Mega et al.). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. or Guo in view of US 2,492,833 (Baumann et al.) or US 2,200,287 (Lysholm). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt or Guo in view of Boetcher or Stone, and further in view of Baumann et al. or Lysholm.

Claims 6 and 10 have been amended, and claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 now contains the limitations of claim 7 and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, thus is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,245,155 (Pratt et al.). Claim 6 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 2004/0191064 (Guo). Claim 6 has been amended to recite the limitations of previous claim 7 and withdrawal of the rejections of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) thus is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. or Guo in view of US 2,288,433 (Boetcher et al.) or US 2,662,277 (Stone).

Pratt discloses single point power feed nozzle for use in laser welding. A fixture 24 is used to support for supporting workpiece portions 12 during the laser welding operation. See col. 3, lines 18 to 21. The method is for gas turbine components.

Guo discloses repairing a worn surface of a turbine blade. See [0013].

Boetcher discloses repairing pipes and plates in which a butt weld is used for specially designed lips. See page 1, second column, line 51 et seq.

Stone discloses joining tubular pipes. See, e.g., claim 1 and col. 1, line 1 et seq.

Claim 6, as amended to include the limitations of previous claim 7, recites a method for joining components under dynamic load comprising:

aligning the at least two gas turbine components relative to one another in an aligned position;

joining the at least two gas turbine components together in the aligned position by an auxiliary weld; and

welding at least two gas turbine components using laser powder build-up welding to form a separate weld to join said at least two gas turbine components together.

First, it is respectfully submitted that Guo does not teach or disclose any aligning, as Guo teaches a crack repair method. See, e.g., [0038] to [0040]. The withdrawal of the rejections with respect to Guo for this reason alone is respectfully requested.

Pratt does not disclose the joining step by an auxiliary weld as claimed. Pratt has a separate fixture for supporting the workpiece and there thus there is, it is respectfully submitted, no need or reason to provide the method of Pratt with “joining the at least two gas turbine components together in the aligned position by an auxiliary weld” as presently claimed. See Pratt, e.g., at col. 3, lines 18 to 21.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would not have looked to either Boetcher or Stone to provide such a joining step to Pratt. Pratt already has a device for aligning, and there is no need for a separate auxiliary weld step. Also, Boetcher is for joining

pipes or plates that have a special lip. As shown in Pratt in Fig. 3, gas turbine components do not have such a special lip. Stone is clearly a brazing method for use with pipes (see entire disclosure and claim 1), and there is no prior art teaching in Stone for any applicability to gas turbine components.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) thus is respectfully requested.


Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt or Guo in view of Boetcher or Stone, and further in view of US 4,224,499 (Jones) or US 2004/0169022 (Mega et al.). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt et al. or Guo in view of US 2,492,833 (Baumann et al.) or US 2,200,287 (Lysholm). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt or Guo in view of Boetcher or Stone, and further in view of Baumann et al. or Lysholm.

In view of the above, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. It is further noted with respect to claim 10 that neither Boetcher nor Stone appear suitable for such steps related to the claimed gas turbine components.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request such action. If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, NY 10018
(212) 736-1940